



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,618	01/31/2005	Tadayuki Kameyama	052009	6711
38834	7590	08/13/2008	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			EMPIE, NATHAN H	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 700			1792	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			MAIL DATE	
			08/13/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/522,618 Examiner NATHAN H. EMPIE	Applicant(s) KAMEYAMA ET AL. Art Unit 1792
---	--	---

–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTO-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claim 12.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 8-18.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/N. H. E./
 Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Katherine A. Bareford/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments directed toward the teachings of Ikemoto, the examiner maintains that Ikemoto has taught general conditions of result effective variables such as the length of submersion, bath concentration, bath temperature, degree of swelling, etc. and their influence on the wrinkle formation (see, for example, abstract, [0007]-[0011], [0030]-[0033], Table 1) and one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that variables influencing the duration of submersion and degree of swelling (such as duration of specific guide roll contact and saturation state) would be result effective variables as well. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have altered such conditions as desired, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicant's arguments directed toward Ikemoto and the use of boric acid are unconvincing, as they are insufficient to outweigh the evidence of obviousness. Although a portion of the teaching of Ikemoto is devoted to boric acid content, the remainder of the teaching is also directed to other result effective variables; wherein the examiner asserts that no matter what chemistry is selected for the swelling bath (as applicant has not particularly specified one either) one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to optimize a process while reducing the duration as it would allow for an increase in output.

The support provided by the applicant to demonstrate unexpected results associated with timing of contact of guide rolls are unconvincing as the demonstration is insufficient to outweigh the evidence of obviousness. Particularly applicant's "example 8" and "comparative example 1" were conducted for one specific polymer film species, and bath chemistry, while the claimed subject matter covers a significantly larger scope without such limitations. Additionally, between these two examples the conditions of the experiment do not appear to be consistent (see, for example, Example 8 was conducted at 42oC, with a PVA film from The Nippon Synthetic Chemical Industry Co., Ltd; while comparative example 1 was conducted at 25oC, with a PVA film from Kuray Co., Ltd) so the "unexpected results" could (in part or in whole) have been attributed to one or these other process differences. .